EXHIBIT H

7

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Case:2:13-cr-20710 Judge: Cleland, Robert H. MJ: Randon, Mark A. Filed: 09-26-2013 At 08:38 AM INFO USA V. MITSUBISHI ELECTRIC COR P (TAM)

٧.

MITSUBISHI ELECTRIC CORPORATION

Defendant.

Violation: 15 U.S.C. § 1

INFORMATION

COUNT ONE CONSPIRACY TO RESTRAIN TRADE (15 U.S.C. § 1)

THE UNITED STATES, ACTING THROUGH ITS ATTORNEYS, CHARGES:

Defendant and Co-Conspirators

- 1. Mitsubishi Electric Corporation ("Defendant") is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Japan with its principal place of business in Tokyo, Japan. During the period covered by this Information, Defendant was engaged in the business of manufacturing and selling various automotive parts, including starter motors, alternators, and ignition coils to Ford Motor Company, General Motors LLC, Chrysler Group LLC, Fuji Heavy Industries Ltd., Nissan Motor Company Ltd., Honda Motor Company Ltd., and certain of their subsidiaries ("automobile manufacturers") for installation in vehicles manufactured and sold in the United States and elsewhere.
- 2. Various corporations and individuals, not made defendants in this Information, participated as co-conspirators in the offense charged in this Information and performed acts and made statements in furtherance of it.

3. Whenever in this Information reference is made to any act, deed, or transaction of any corporation, the allegation means that the corporation engaged in the act, deed, or transaction by or through its officers, directors, employees, agents, or other representatives while they were actively engaged in the management, direction, control, or transaction of its business or affairs.

Background of the Offense

- 4. During the period covered by this Information, Defendant and its co-conspirators supplied automotive parts to automobile manufacturers for installation in vehicles manufactured and sold in the United States and elsewhere. During the period covered by this Information, Defendant and its co-conspirators manufactured automotive parts: (a) in the United States and elsewhere for installation in vehicles manufactured and sold in the United States; (b) in Japan and elsewhere for export to the United States and installation in vehicles manufactured and sold in the United States; and (c) in Japan and elsewhere for installation in vehicles manufactured in Japan and elsewhere for export to and sale in the United States.
- 5. The defendant manufactured various automotive parts, including starter motors, alternators, and ignition coils. Starter motors are small electric motors used in starting internal combustion engines. Alternators generate an electric current while the engine is in operation. Ignition coils are part of the fuel ignition system and release electric energy suddenly to ignite a fuel mixture. When purchasing automotive parts, automobile manufacturers typically issue Requests for Quotation ("RFQs") to automotive parts suppliers on a model-by-model basis for model specific parts. Automotive parts suppliers submit quotations, or bids, to the automobile manufacturers in response to RFQs, and the automobile manufacturers award the business to the selected automotive parts supplier for the lifespan of the model, which is usually four to six years. Typically, the bidding process for a particular model begins approximately three years

prior to the start of production. Automobile manufacturers procure parts for U.S.-manufactured vehicles in the United States and elsewhere.

Conspiracy to Restrain Trade

- 6. From at least as early as January 2000 and continuing until at least February 2010, the exact dates being unknown to the United States, Defendant and its co-conspirators participated in a combination and conspiracy to suppress and eliminate competition in the automotive parts industry by agreeing to rig bids for, and to fix, stabilize, and maintain the price of, certain automotive parts sold to automobile manufacturers in the United States and elsewhere. The combination and conspiracy engaged in by Defendant and its co-conspirators was in unreasonable restraint of interstate and foreign trade and commerce in violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1.
- 7. The charged combination and conspiracy consisted of a continuing agreement, understanding, and concert of action among Defendant and its co-conspirators, the substantial terms of which were to rig bids for, and to fix, stabilize, and maintain the prices of, certain automotive parts, including starter motors, alternators, and ignition coils, sold to automobile manufacturers in the United States and elsewhere.

Manner and Means of the Conspiracy

- 8. For purposes of forming and carrying out the charged combination and conspiracy, Defendant and its co-conspirators did those things that they combined and conspired to do, including, among other things:
 - a. participating in meetings, conversations, and communications in the United States and elsewhere to discuss the bids and price quotations to be submitted to automobile manufacturers in the United States and elsewhere;

- b. agreeing, during those meetings, conversations, and communications, on
 bids and price quotations to be submitted to automobile manufacturers in the United
 States and elsewhere;
- c. agreeing, during those meetings, conversations, and communications, to allocate the supply of certain automotive parts sold to automobile manufacturers in the United States and elsewhere;
- d. agreeing, during those meetings, conversations, and communications, to coordinate price adjustments requested by automobile manufacturers in the United States and elsewhere;
- e. submitting certain bids, price quotations, and price adjustments to automobile manufacturers in the United States and elsewhere in accordance with the agreements reached;
- f. selling certain automotive parts to automobile manufacturers in the United States and elsewhere at collusive and noncompetitive prices;
- g. accepting payment for certain automotive parts sold to automobile manufacturers in the United States and elsewhere at collusive and noncompetitive prices;
- h. engaging in meetings, conversations, and communications in the United States and elsewhere for the purpose of monitoring and enforcing adherence to the agreed-upon bid-rigging and price-fixing scheme; and
- i. employing measures to keep their conduct secret, including, but not
 limited to, using code names and meeting at remote locations.

Trade and Commerce

9. During the period covered by this Information, Defendant and its co-conspirators sold to automobile manufacturers located in various states in the United States substantial

quantities of various automotive parts shipped from outside the United States and from other states in a continuous and uninterrupted flow of interstate and foreign trade and commerce. In addition, substantial quantities of equipment and supplies necessary to the production and distribution of various automotive parts sold by Defendant and its co-conspirators, as well as payments for various automotive parts sold by Defendant and its co-conspirators, traveled in interstate and foreign trade and commerce. The business activities of Defendant and its co-conspirators in connection with the production and sale of certain automotive parts that were the subject of the charged conspiracy were within the flow of, and substantially affected, interstate and foreign trade and commerce.

Jurisdiction and Venue

10. The combination and conspiracy charged in this Information was carried out, at least in part, in the Eastern District of Michigan within the five years preceding the filing of this Information.

ALL IN VIOLATION OF TITLE 15, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 1.

Dated: SEPTEMBER 26, 2013

s/SCOTT D. HAMMOND

Scott D. Hammond Deputy Assistant Attorney General Antitrust Division United States Department of Justice

s/LISA M. PHELAN

Lisa M. Phelan Chief, National Criminal Enforcement Section Antitrust Division United States Department of Justice

s/MARVIN N. PRICE

Marvin N. Price Director of Criminal Enforcement Antitrust Division United States Department of Justice

s/KATHRYN M. HELLINGS

Kathryn M. Hellings Mark C. Grundvig Jason D. Jones Ryan J. Danks Paul T. Gallagher Trial Attorneys United States Department of Justice

Antitrust Division National Criminal Enforcement Section 450 5th St. NW, Suite 11300 Washington, DC 20530-0001 (202) 307-6694

MJ. Randon, Mark A. Filed: 09-26-2013 At 08:38 AM

INFO USA V. MITSUBISHI ELECTRIC COR P (TAM)

United States District Court

Eastern District of Michigan	Criminal Case Cov				
NOTE: It is the responsibility of the Trial At	torney signing this form to c	omplete it accurately	y in all respects.		
Reassignment/Recusal Info	rmation This matter was	opened in the USA	O prior to Augus	t 15, 2008 []	
Companion Case Information		Companion Case Number: 2:12-cr-20063			
This may be a companion case based upon LCrR 57.10 (b)(4)¹:		Judge Assigned: Hon. George C. Steeh			
⊠ Yes □ No		AUSA's Initials: KH			
Case Title: USA v. Mitsubisl	hi Electric Corporation				
County where offense occ	urred : Wayne County	& Elsewhere			
Check One: 🔀 Felony	☐ Mis	sdemeanor			
Indictment/Inf Indictment/Inf	formation no prior com formation based upon formation based upon		ase number: nplete Supersedin] og section below].	
Superseding Case Informati	on		3.52011		
Superseding to Case No:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Judge:			
Corrects errors; no add	inated; no additional charg itional charges or defenda ses, different charges or a t matter but adds the add	ants. adds counts.		ow:	
<u>Defendant name</u>	<u>Cha</u>	arges	Prior Compla	aint (if applicable)	
Please take notice that the below captioned case. 1/26/2013 Date	Katie Hellin Trial Attorno U.S. Dept. National Cr 450 5th St., Washington Phone: (20	gs	ust Division ent Section	the above	

E-Mail address: katie.hellings@usdoj.gov

¹ Companion cases are matters in which it appears that (1) substantially similar evidence will be offered at trial, (2) the same or related parties are present, and the cases arise out of the same transaction or occurrence. Cases may be companion cases even though one of them may have already been terminated. (5/20/13)